

Identity

£1.95

November 2004

Issue 49



**New Wave Of Attacks On The Freedoms
They Died To Save**

See Pages 18 & 19



November's News

■ Close Second in Dagenham

Following the outstanding BNP win by Dan Kelley in the Goresbrook Ward, Dagenham, with 51.9% of the poll, last month saw BNP candidate Lawrence Rustem come close second in Village Ward, Dagenham, with 38.4%. Back in July the Party came second with 30% in Valence ward, Dagenham.

Labour shipped in workers from all over the South East to hold Village Ward. More important, their main activity was in mobilising the very recent immigrant vote that tipped the balance in this white flight area. The more, the BNP vote in Village in June was substantially lower than in Goresbrook, so this latest result was very credible.

■ BNP Train Driver Reinstated

Train Driver Jay Lee won an historic victory at an Employment Tribunal last month. It held unanimously that Jay Lee had been unlawfully expelled from his trade union ASLEF for his BNP membership. He is now entitled to claim thousands of pounds in compensation and costs.

Mr Lee has said that he plans to stand as an ASLEF official "to bring democracy back to the union."

■ Italy and Spain Deport Illegals

Italy and Spain set a good example last month for what should be a "fortress Europe" policy on Third World immigration. A total of 1,787 illegal immigrants, mainly African, arrived on Lampedusa off Italy's southern coast in one week. The Italian immigration authorities promptly put them on Hercules transport aircraft and flew them to Libya, from where they had departed crammed aboard fishing boats.

The UN High Commissioner for Refugees accused Italy of employing "hurried" and "forced mass-deportation" methods, adding that some people were being kept from claiming the asylum "that was their

natural right". The Italian reply was a diplomatic version of "get stuffed", in Italian, of course. They added that "if we had not acted with determination, we would have attracted thousands more immigrants, encouraging the strategy of the criminal groups who manage these flows".

It is high time that Blunkett and Blair followed the Italian example.

Meanwhile in Spain's Canary islands nearly 6,000 illegal immigrants from the African coast (just 80 miles away) have been quietly deported from the island of Fuerteventura so far this year, 176 of them arriving in one batch on a rusty steamer last month.

■ 'British' Islamic Link to Beslan Child Massacre

A member of the group responsible for the Beslan school massacre in September is a British citizen who attended the infamous Finsbury Park mosque. Two other members of the group, loyal to Chechen warlord Shamil Basayev, are also believed to have been active in the UK until less than three years ago.

Russian security forces described Algerian-born Kamel Rabat, the eldest of the three who came from London, as a "key aide" of Basayev who has boasted of training the men who took control of the school and wired it with explosives.

■ Red Ken Says 'End Tube Immigration Checks'

Ken Livingstone, who last month hosted a leftist conference paid for out of Londoners' rates and attended by 20,000 international Marxists, has now called for the Immigration Service to halt its policy of carrying out immigration checks on the Tube.

His comments came after it emerged that immigration officers, working with British Transport Police, are stopping passengers on the Underground to check their immigration status as part of a crack-down on illegal immigrants. Since May

last year 1,000 people have been detained in the campaign.

"This looks like targeting of black people by the Immigration Service and I would like to see it completely stopped", said Red Ken. "The Transport Police are there to stop criminal and anti-social behaviour, not to aid activities which could be regarded by black and Asian people as harassment."

■ IRA Bomber "Is As Bad As Bigley's Killers"



This was said of Patrick Magee, the Brighton bomber, by Lord Tebbit when Magee decided to visit the scene of his murders during the recent Tory Conference. Lord Tebbit was injured and his wife permanently paralysed by the bomb outrage.

He told BBC Radio Ulster people should not forget that the IRA had murdered more people than al-Qa'eda had in the September 11 attacks. "I would put him in the same category as the people who recently murdered Mr Bigley psychopathic killers who would kill again if they had the chance."

Identity

Editor: John Bean

November 2004

Public reference:

ISSN 1469-7971

Subscriptions Dept:

PO Box 907,

Hull, HU6 9WY

Tel: 0870 75 73 267.

Note: Back issues can only be supplied for a minimum of 3 copies.

Articles should be submitted to the addresses below in

typed/electronic format.

PO Box 97, Newmarket,

Suffolk CB8 8WT.

Email: Identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk.

How To Increase Pensions

Much has been said in recent weeks about the pension time bomb facing this country in the next 15 to 25 years unless radical reforms are made. Encouragement for the younger generation to save more in private pensions makes sense, although the virtually fraudulent behaviour of some pension companies in the recent past does not give them much encouragement. In the crystal ball gazing by the media pension pundits I did not see any mention of the key issue; that the commercially productive people of this country are not having enough children, mainly because the women need to carry on working to pay the high mortgages on homes whose prices have been forced up by the pressure of immigration. It is these missing children of today who are needed to pay the pensions of tomorrow. Those who are having the children are the unproductive (black, white and brown), who compound the situation by being a further drain on state funds.

Both the above issues need to be tackled, as they would be under a BNP government, before real progress can be made in planning pensions for the next generation. However, what of today's pensioners, who on a basic of £79.60 have the lowest pension in Western Europe? Britain's 14 million pensioners could have an increase of £10 per week, without raising taxes, by saving on specific targets, and not by sloganising on "cut waste, cut bureaucracy, cut the civil servants".

Target one is to withdraw from the EU and save the £3 billion a year which it costs us after the rebate from Brussels - which we are likely to lose in the near future. This would give each pensioner £214 a year.

Target two, is to take £2 billion of the £3 billion a year which the Government has admitted is spent on housing and allowances for asylum seekers and other illegals, to give £107 a year. We have left a billion to be reasonable, for even if the Government had the courage (most unlikely) to follow Italy's new example and send all new and failed asylum seekers back immediately, the rest of the problem could not be solved overnight.

Target three is to take half of the £4 billion that is given as overseas aid (mainly ending up lining politicians' and chieftains' pockets) to give each pensioner another £143. In this case we only suggest taking half so as to leave £2 billion in the kitty for implementing the BNP policy of supplying fares and resettlement grants to those immigrants who wish to return to their homelands.

Thus, we have a total saving of £500 each per annum and with a few savings made on the hidden costs of asylum seekers, eg. NHS and schooling, we easily obtain the extra £20 million to give each pensioner his/her £10 per week rise.

A FAIR DEAL FOR THE PALESTINIANS

In the first two weeks of October thirty Palestinian children and teenagers were killed by Israeli soldiers in the Gaza strip. One incident, which received some minor coverage



in the UK press, was that of a 13-year-old school girl, carrying her school bag on her back, who was shot as she passed an Israeli watchtower. The company commander then approached and fired two shots into her head and then emptied the rest of his magazine into her body. All she had in her bag were books.

Two days later, ITV went to the same girls' school, where another pupil had been shot at her desk by a stray bullet fired by nearby Israeli settlers. Any parent (or grandparent) could not fail to be distressed and angry at the sight of the trauma these girls were suffering. But Britain and the West does nothing. No wonder the Arabs, once our friends, now hate us.

We know that Israeli children have also been killed by Palestinian bombers, but the immediate question arises of what are Israeli settlers doing in the Gaza strip when the area is crammed with camps to house the descendants of the Palestinian refugees who were forced off their lands when the Israeli state was born? Before we are accused of being 'anti-Semitic', there are many Jews who are anti-Zionists and forecast that the actions of the state of Israel will rebound on Jews everywhere: and they are being proven right.

Let us face it. British soldiers are dying in Iraq in order to protect Israel and America's oil interests. If Britain were to insist that Israel should follow the decisions of the United Nations, pull down their wall - which also annexes more Arab territory - and stop destroying Palestinian homes on the slightest pretext, then there would be a chance of a sea-change in the Middle East. We could then take this further by saying: "We will not interfere in your affairs, or try to impose Western customs, and you in return can stop trying to colonise us."

John Bean

Editor



In the first part of this article, published last month, NICK GRIFFIN predicted that UKIP's European Election successes would soon be overshadowed by that party's "internal contradictions", and explained how the Conservatives remain our most dangerous opponent. He continues by examining how the coming General Election offers us a chance to

DRIVE A STAKE THROUGH HOWARD'S HEART!



The Conservatives are down, but not yet out. Losing another General Election would certainly compound their problems, primarily by leading to another round of factional bloodletting as the knives flash for the lacklustre Michael Howard. But, as the recovery of the Labour party after the disastrous years under Foot and Kinnock showed, even a desperately sick Establishment party can recover in the end, once its rival makes itself sufficiently unpopular.

Provided, that is, that it retains its status as the only credible alternative party of government, something which the Labour party – despite a scare at the hands of the Social Democrats – managed to do. If it fails to do so, however, things can be very different.

The classic example in British politics was the fate of the Liberals between the two World Wars, when they lost their status as Tweedledum to the Tories' Tweedledee to the upstart Labour party, and were effectively wiped off the political map for decades. For a party in this position, the problem begins with the loss of so many parliamentary seats that it loses its status as the Official Opposition (and, by implication, Government-in-Waiting), but ends up going far deeper than that.

Next comes the loss of public recognition as the media cease to ask its spokesmen what they think about current events. Then there follows the

dimming (yes, it is possible!) of its next generation of up-and-coming 'stars', as the reduced chances of power and preferment make it less attractive to ambitious live-wires.

At local level, the impact is even more catastrophic as the impoverished party centre (what multi-millionaire capitalist is going to give large donations to a party which has no chance of winning national power and giving him a return on his 'investment'?) lays off paid agents, organisers and propagandists, leaving the demoralised grass-roots to fend for themselves.

Feeling important on account of being on first-name terms with their local MP is a potent motivating factor for many local volunteers; take it away and many simply drop out. In a party whose average activist is already well past retirement age, such additional losses can rapidly lead to the inability even to find candidates for unwinnable council wards, let alone the activists needed to put up an effective campaign in previously winnable ones.

TOTAL COLLAPSE

Put all these factors together with the overall problem faced by a Conservative party that no longer knows what it wants to conserve, and you have a recipe for near total collapse.

By the time the forthcoming

General Election is upon us, the Blair regime is likely to be so unpopular that large numbers of Labour MPs would normally be expected to lose their seats to the locally more credible challenger, either Conservative or Liberal Democrat.

Where the Lib Dems are in the front-running, they are likely to benefit to a limited extent from tactical voting by former Tories who are desperate to get Labour out, and in those circumstances there is nothing anyone can do to stop Kennedy's rag-bag of losers, political illiterates, paedophiles and Europhiles winning extra seats.

Where the Conservative candidate is the main challenger, however, any anti-Labour tactical voting by LibDems is likely to be offset by the loss of several thousand right-wing Tory votes to UKIP.

True, the latter have just lost their big money-bags backer Paul Sykes, and are wracked by full-scale civil war between the Nigel Farage 'cabal' and the permatanned Richard Desmond stooge Robert Kilroy-Silk. But the odds are that one faction or another will pull things together enough to stand hundreds of largely self-funded candidates, each putting out at least an election address and taking enough True Blue votes to deny the Conservatives a large number of otherwise winnable Labour seats.

Even worse for the embattled Tory leadership, almost the entire Shadow

Cabinet sit in marginal seats where the Lib Dems were already breathing down their necks last time around. Since then, the Lib Dems' superb local politics machine has been unleashed with particular vigour and ruthless deceitfulness in these key target seats. Even without the intervention of UKIP, the Tories might be hard-pressed to hold on in them. So with significant numbers of 'right-wing' voters in each one switching away from Howard's new look sky-blue-and-pink party, the Lib Dems' stated aim of "decapitating the Conservative party" could well be achieved.

Where the current Tory MP is a Europhile, this is still likely to be achieved by UKIP without any help from us. Where he or she is a right-wing Eurosceptic, however, there is a strong possibility that, if UKIP do not actually refrain from standing altogether, they will run a deliberately low-key campaign so as to avoid handing the seat to the Europhile Lib Dems.

TORIES ARE FAIR GAME

To the BNP, by contrast, all Conservative MPs are fair game. In fact, the ones we most need to unseat are precisely the 'right-wingers' whose presence gives their party a fig leaf of credibility with many people who might otherwise vote for us. We must do everything we can to ensure that these individuals lose their seats, not least because the result will be to shift the political centre of gravity of the Tory party even further to the left, thereby opening up even more political space for us to its right.



This may mean us contesting some well-to-do seats where our vote is going to be frankly pathetic. If we only get 250 votes in some posh stockbroker-belt constituency, but the Conservative misses out to the Lib Dems by 245 votes, we will have scored a valuable long-term victory.

Nor is it just a matter of the votes we actually take, our presence – fighting on a strong right-wing ticket – will seriously limit the local Conservatives' room for manoeuvre. For if they are the most 'right-wing' party standing, there is nothing to stop them using their campaign literature to position themselves as pinkish moderates, not so far from the Lib Dems themselves.

Their calculation here would be that this would minimise the number of votes they lose to the Lib Dems, while right-wing voters would still have no choice but to vote for them as the lesser evil. Our presence, however, will pin them down in their own middle ground, resulting in our shaving some support off their right, while the Lib Dems take votes from their left. Caught in such a twin-prong attack, a number of otherwise safe Tory seats could well change hands.

With the Tories at present holding 166 parliamentary seats compared to the Lib Dem's 56, there is a big gap between the two rivals for Official Opposition status but, as the calculations presented at the end of this article show, there is a real possibility that the tables could be turned at the next General Election.

I am not saying that the Conservative party is going to suffer the kind of annihilation its counterpart in Canada did a few years ago, though it could do. But even if the disaster isn't on that scale, to have the Tories come out of the contest even weaker than they are now is by far the most realistic benefit that we could win from the next General Election. Working to help make it happen is our therefore most important objective.

There may be some readers whose understandable loathing of the Blair regime is so great that they find it hard to stomach kicking the Tories when they're down, thereby helping to ensure another five years of hard Labour or a Labour/Lib Dem leftist coalition. Such a reaction is wholly understandable, but tactically naïve nevertheless.

To have any validity it would have to



Stephen Harper, leader of the embattled Canadian Conservative party

be the case that a Conservative government would do something to reverse Blair's Destruction of Britain project. Since it is crystal clear that the modern Tory party is totally incapable of doing any such thing, it is utterly useless. Better to get it out of the way so that there is electoral space for the genuine political and cultural counter-revolution which is the only thing that can save our nation and the people who built it.

GROWING LIBERAL ARROGANCE

In particular, we can be sure that the decline of the Tory party to third place also-rans would lead the ruling left-liberal elite to become even more unbearably arrogant. They would, to put it plainly, take the tax-paying Silent Majority and rub their noses in the filth of the nanny state and multiculturalism. Nothing could suit our purposes more, for things have to get a lot worse before we will be given the chance to make them better.

Finally, the idea that we should be slightly more sympathetic to the Conservatives than to any other faction of the liberal globalist ruling elite is based on a seriously flawed understanding of what genuine nationalism is all about.

Yes, it is true that we would (did) tend to agree with the Tories when they are (were), for example, tougher on crime, more in favour of the family, and stood for higher defence spending. But such 'policies' were rarely more than



vote-winning sound-bites at the best of times, and on most such issues even the pretence has now been dropped.

Similarly, we had quite a bit in common with Old Labour when they stood for the defence of British jobs and for decent housing for working class communities. True nationalism has always stood beyond and above the old 'left'/'right' divide.

This is even more so now that the left have swallowed the poison of globalism, and the right has sold the pass on the healthy social values it once championed. We do not owe the Conservative party the slightest shred of consideration.

But in a time when scarcely a month goes by without a fresh indication of the essentially dictatorial nature of modern 'liberalism', wouldn't a stronger Tory party give us at least some cover from the kind of repression that Blunkett and his ilk are clearly itching to unleash on us? Dream on! It is the leader of the Conservative group on the Greater London Assembly who is advocating the persecution of BNP firemen in our capital.

For every friendly, old-fashioned grass roots Tory who shook our hands at one of the counts in June, there were two or three wearing the anti-BNP stickers produced by the Trotskyite thugs of 'Unite'. Even more seriously, the demonisation rhetoric regularly spewed out against us by senior Conservatives such as Michael Howard and Eric Pickles is helping to create the witch-hunt climate in which anti-democratic repression flourishes.

Having concluded that the Tory party deserves to die, and that we must help it on its way, we see that UKIP – artificially boosted by the Establishment to keep us out in June – is our temporary and unwitting best ally. It is the battering ram which could break down the Conservative party.

Is it not also an enemy? Yes, of course it is, but it is so less well established than the Tories, so much more unstable (as we are seeing right now – Ed.), so unlikely to survive more than a few years as a remotely credible force, that we need worry about it far less.

All other parties are our enemies, because, in the end, they are all part and parcel of the rotten Establishment that has condemned our people to dispossession, cultural destruction and genocide through forced integration. However much on our

wavelength some UKIP activists are, their party is as bad as the rest.

But we can't beat the other parties all at once, so we must seek out the most easily beaten – or the one from whose discomfort we have the most to gain – and deal with them first. And we must use one against another, letting them do our work for us. In fact, this is so important that, despite the pleasure we can derive from seeing UKIP's opportunistic leaders hoist with their own permatanned petard, we have to hope that Kilroy-Silk's leadership challenge doesn't destroy their party before the next election.

For if UKIP did collapse we would have to give serious consideration to contesting at least another one hundred possible Tory seats, even though we take votes more equally off the other parties and so would not do as much damage to the Conservatives as UKIP will if they can hold together. It will be far better for us if UKIP staggers on for long enough to scupper the Tories – which is precisely why we left them alone to drive Howard's losers into fourth place in Hartlepool.

The time to deal with the US puppets, liberals and cowards in UKIP will come, so a few more BNP infiltrators burrowing into their middle management while they are in disarray wouldn't go amiss. But, for now, we should look on them as allies on the next leg of our long march to power – driving an electoral stake through the heart of Michael Howard and the walking corpse that is the Conservative Party.



Bob Neill: Conservative group leader on the London Assembly

WIPE-OUT! - Is Time Up For The Tory Vampires?

Present parliamentary status: 166 Tory seats, 56 Lib Dem seats.

If the Lib Dems take 50 Labour seats, and the swing to UKIP from the Conservatives stops the Tories winning any Labour seats, the figure would shift to 166 to 106 – a difference of just 60.

If UKIP and BNP vote-splitting exercises allow the Lib Dems to take 30 Conservative seats as well, Charles Kennedy and Michael Howard's successor would each have the same number of MPs. Every extra Tory seat lost to the Lib Dems on top of that would open up the gap between them by two MPs.

If the only swing of the night was from the Tories to UKIP, it would take a massive swing of 10% to lose the Conservatives 43 seats, and some of those would be to Labour. It would take an unthinkable swing of 16% to put the Tories in 3rd place.

But all elections involve multiple swings. Look, for

example, at what could happen in Michael Howard's seat in Folkestone: 2001 results: Howard 20,645, LD 14,738, Lab 9,260, UKIP 1,212 (2.64%). Vampire majority 5,907.

Even a 10% switch to UKIP, or an isolated swing of 10% from Labour to the Lib Dems, would still leave Howard with a majority of 1,321.

But a multiple swing of 4% to UKIP or the BNP from the Tories, combined with an 8% shift from Labour to the Lib Dems – and Michael Howard and all his anti-BNP lies would be history.

UKIP were hyped up to steal our earthquake in June 2004, but sometime, pretty soon, the aftershock could turn the Conservative party into a pile of rubble, and clear the way for our genuine nationalism. Is that why Kilroy-Silk now seems so determined to destroy what his 'celebrity status' just created?

Nuclear Power - For and Against



As the BNP is more 'green' than the old Lib-Lab-Con parties, it is not surprising that Ralph Ellis's excellent article in our September issue looking at alternative power systems should arouse some opposition. That opposition was solely concerned with his support of completely emissions-free nuclear power (using only the most modern and safe systems) as the most viable alternative to continue burning hydrocarbons, or using uneconomic wind and/or tidal power systems. It is stressed that the support for nuclear power is not official BNP policy, but was put forward by Ralph for readers to think over. As someone who spent his working life in the field of industrial chemistry, your editor must confess that he finds much in favour of Ralph's arguments. But here are some alternative views.

Producing Electricity in the Home

I would definitely not want to see any more nuclear power stations being built in Britain, let alone an 80% figure for electricity generated by nuclear power, and would definitely be upset if the BNP made it policy.

There are many methods of producing electricity and heat for use in the home domestic market to lessen the need for nuclear power and there are methods of storage using new type deep cycle/gel batteries for home use.

Solar panels for heat and electricity are far better than they used to be. The thought of using solar/wind/tidal production is far from taking us back to the Stone Age, as Ralph Ellis implies. People like myself use power inverters, solar panels and wind turbines to great effect, and buy DC appliances which are more economic to run than AC. Maybe the BNP should campaign to change our electric supply to DC?

In fact some of the energy used to update the BNP Land and People website is produced by my solar panels and adds no extra pollution to our environment other than the initial creation of parts for panels and inverter and batteries.

The BNP would do well to adopt the use of wind turbines which are very effective, so much so that the excess energy has to be burnt off by diverting the excess and burning it off by loading, and Britain happens to be the windiest location in Europe.

New tiles are available which use the sun to make electricity. If these were mass produced, along with other alternative energy producing items, they would be cheap enough to supply most homes in Britain with cheap electricity.

Another thought on alternative energy comes from a press statement released by the National Energy Foundation on 15/07/04. It said that most of Britain's homes could be heated from heat collecting pipe work

buried in their gardens, which is then collected by the use of 'Ground Source Heat Pumps'. Apparently if 10% of British homes installed this between now and 2020, the result could be a colossal one million tonnes of carbon savings.

For further information see our BNP Land and People website.

Barry Bennett, Bournemouth BNP

The High Cost of Wind Power

I found Ralph Ellis's case for the use of nuclear power thought-provoking, and while his point that the Chernobyl disaster (well 'milked' by the anti-Nuclear lobby) arose because of its outdate technology and slipshod maintenance, I think that the jury is still out on the complete safety of nuclear power.

As for wind power, each colossal eyesore upon our countryside will only generate enough electricity to power a row or two of houses, and at a very high cost. This, of course, when the wind is not too low or too high. I suspect that it is the manufacturers, all German or Danish, who are pushing the use of this extremely expensive alternative power source. Also, let us remember that each turbine only has a maximum life of about ten years.

Tony Rawlinson, Gloucester

Unpopular With The Electorate


I can't believe that you are considering adopting reliance on nuclear power as a policy. This would be hugely unpopular with the electorate. It goes against other BNP policies, e.g. support for organic farming and family farms. Despite supporting everything else the BNP stands for, I would have to withdraw my support if this became part of your manifesto.

Paul Adams, e-mail



Nov 2004

South Africa



How The Afrikaners Were Hoaxed: The Lie Of Apartheid

Arthur Kemp, who writes from South Africa, gives what some readers may consider a controversial view on the failure of Apartheid

peoples and the subsequent disappearance of their civilisation, has direct implications in racial terms. The rise and fall of any particular civilisation can therefore be traced, not by the economics, politics, morals etc. of a particular civilisation, but rather by the actual racial presence of the people themselves. If the society which has produced a particular civilisation stays intact as a racially homogeneous unit, then that civilisation remains active.

If, however, the society within any particular given area changes its racial makeup - through invasion, immigration or any decline in numbers - then the civilisation which that society produced will disappear, to be replaced by a new civilisation reflecting the new inhabitants of that territory.

It is one of the many bitter ironies about South Africa that the policy of Apartheid - to which Afrikaners clung for decades as their only hope and salvation from Third World domination - was in fact an impracticable and unworkable system which led directly to the Afrikaners' demise as a political force in that country.

The politicians - the National Party - who fostered Apartheid are primarily responsible for this tragedy, holding out a false illusory hope to the Afrikaners, and then when the inevitable became just that, changing track and giving in, abandoning their followers to ANC rule as callously as they had earlier lied to them. For Apartheid, in reality forced social segregation, was nothing but an illusion, a twisted distortion of the demographic reality of South Africa, not to mention the truth that it was, ultimately, morally repugnant as well.

The conservative White South African politicians, of all parties, never understood, and possibly still today, do not understand, what the driving force of political power is: namely, physical occupation. Political power comes from physical occupation: not historical rights, not title deeds, not

moral rights - only occupation. *Those people who occupy a territory determine the nature of the society in that region.*

Two examples, familiar to all, illustrate this point well:

Example 1: North America. On that continent, the American Indian (Amerind) people lived for thousands of years, creating a culture which dominated that continent. The culture of North America reflected the fact that the Amerinds lived and formed the majority population there. After 1500 AD, however, that continent filled up with White immigrants from Europe. These White immigrants displaced the Amerinds by squeezing them out of possession of North America.

The great shift in North America then occurred. Whereas the Amerind culture had dominated for thousands of years, in a few hundred years the dominant civilisation on that continent had become White European. This shift reflected the fact that the majority of inhabitants of North America had become White Europeans - and the Amerind civilisation "fell" because the population of North America changed.

This effect, the displacement of

Example 2: Israel. The state of Israel is today a political reality, not because the Bible says Jews belong there (although many Jews and Christians might think so) but simply because the Zionist movement has ensured that Jews are a majority in that territory. This was done through a deliberate policy of settlement, immigration and ethnic cleansing coordinated over decades. This also forms the rationale behind the current Israeli government's plans to build up Jewish settlements in the West Bank: by physically occupying the territory they hope to change the make-up of that region to the point where it becomes *de facto* part of Israel.

DEMOGRAPHIC REALITY

History teaches us that there are two main reasons for a change in the racial make-up of any society: either military occupation; or the use of foreign or alien labour. The American Indians serve as a text book example of the "military occupation" case study, as detailed above, while South Africa serves as a text book example of the "use of foreign labour" case study.

When a change occurs through the

use of alien labour, the following process occurs:

- The dominant society imports (usually racially) foreign labour to do the menial work in that society;
- These ethnic aliens then become established, settle down and multiply in numbers by drawing upon the society's structures (in White countries, their science, healthcare, technology etc);
- They grow in number, and finally dominate that society by their sheer numbers.

It is, simply put, a demographic reality: those who occupy a land, determine the nature of that society. And so it was and is with South Africa, where population figures reveal precisely how the use of alien labour by the Afrikaners dispossessed them of their fatherland.

Consider the following: in 1904, the first population census of the old Transvaal revealed that there were 297,277 Whites, and 937,127 Non-Whites in that region. ['*Transvaal*', 1911 Encyclopaedia Britannica, <http://61.1911encyclopedia.org/T/TR/TRANVAAL.htm>]

Importantly, the 1904 census also tells us that of these Non-whites, some 135,042 were not from the Transvaal, and only were in the "*Witwatersrand to work in the gold and other mines*" and that only 77% of all Blacks in the Transvaal in 1904 were actually born there. ['*Transvaal*', 1911 Encyclopaedia Britannica, <http://61.1911encyclopedia.org/T/TR/TRANVAAL.htm>]

What this means is that, with the transient migrant labourers removed

from the equation, there were 297,277 Whites and 802,085 Transvaal-born Blacks in the region.

Now, according to the 1960 census, the population of the Transvaal numbered 6,225,052, of which only 1,455,372 were Whites ('*Transvaal*', Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1966, Volume 22, page 423). This was just the figures for the Transvaal, it needs to be noted. For the entire country, the figures were/are even more frightening: 4.5 million Whites to anywhere between 30 and 35 million Non-whites.

What caused this disproportionate population imbalance to swing from 802,000 Blacks in the Boer homeland in 1904, to 4,769,680 in 1960 - just 56 years? The answer: the Black numbers multiplied because they were drawn to the Transvaal by the offer of work, and once settled there, used White society benefits (healthcare, technology etc.) to exponentially increase their numbers.

The formalisation of Apartheid by the National Party after 1948 did therefore not address the real issue which has faced every minority trying to rule over a majority country throughout history: namely, the contradiction of allowing huge numbers of ethnic aliens into the territory in question to do the labour; whilst trying to prevent that civilisation from being overwhelmed by foreign numbers.

The truth is that it cannot be done. In South Africa, almost every White household had (and still has) one or more Black servant. Afrikaner farmers who are the subject of a viciously high rate of attacks and murders generally have hundreds of Black labourers working their huge farmlands. In the mines, the economic heart of the

country, the vast majority of common labourers, numbering many hundreds of thousands, are Black.

All over the country the overwhelming majority of labourers doing almost everything, from factory work to driving, from road building to house building, were (and still are) Black.

Over this mass of economic integration, the Apartheid government attempted to enforce social segregation and still maintain a White government: it was a plan which was doomed from the start.

BASED ON A FALLACY

Apartheid was based on a fallacy: the fallacy that non-whites could be used as labour to drive society; that non-whites could physically form a majority inside South Africa, but that they would not determine the nature of South African society.

This then, was the lie of Apartheid: that it was possible, through strict segregation, to ensure that Blacks could not rule over a country in which they were/are the majority.

The historical record is clear: there has never been a society in which the majority of the population has not determined the nature of that society. Nowhere, ever.

White South Africans, it must be said, more or less believed the lie: They were happy to have Black domestic servants; to have Blacks serve them in restaurants; iron their clothes; make up the very beds they slept in - and were prepared to believe that this mass of established Black labour inside their territory would never have any affect upon the political power structure of their country.

It is said, in fact, that the definition of a White South African is "someone who would rather be murdered in their bed than make it." Amusing? To be honest, not really: consider these true examples:

- Under Apartheid, Blacks could not use White public toilets, but they were used to clean those same toilets each day. One can only wonder at the naivety of such an arrangement.

- Under Apartheid, Blacks could work in restaurant kitchens, prepare the food, put it on the plates and deliver it to the White patrons' tables, but could

Zionist military occupation in the West Bank





not eat that food at the same table in that same restaurant. What hypocrisy is that? Surely if one was going to be consistent, one would have forbidden Blacks from working in restaurants completely: but no, Apartheid didn't go that far, it was built upon the premise that Blacks did do the work.

Cynical observers talked about the "lawn mower" syndrome amongst South African Whites. They regarded Black labour as akin to lawn mowers. A lawn mower sits quietly in its shed or garage until you need it, then it mows the grass, and then you put it back in the shed where it stays quietly, not causing any trouble, until the next time it is needed.

Somehow, White South Africans believed that Black labour was like a lawn mower: you could have it around, and when you didn't need it, you could hide it in its little shed where it would be good and quiet until you needed it again. The reality is, of course, dramatically different.

Another important part of the Apartheid lie was that military force could keep the system intact. The demographic reality once again belies this: the South African White population totalled about five million at its height, while the Black population at that time was around 30 million.

Of the five million Whites, fewer than 800,000 were of military serviceable age, and not even all of these could be called up at any one time, so in reality the state had to rely on no more than a few hundred thousand military personnel at any one time, to try and control a Black population of millions.

REALITY

Given that demographic reality, it can be seen that Apartheid was unsustainable by military means. Yet the lie continued, and young White South Africans were conscripted into the army and police to fight and die for a system which was doomed from the very beginning.

At the same time, White Western healthcare and technology was made available on a massive scale: the largest hospital in the Southern Hemisphere was erected in the Black township of Soweto, outside Johannesburg, specifically for the Black population. Infant mortality rates for Blacks, fell dramatically (and were



SHORT MEMORIES: Western politicians soon forgot that Mandela was a terrorist killer

way below that of the rest of Black ruled Africa). This rapid population growth put additional pressure on the demographic makeup of the country.

As the demographic balloon swelled further and further, the Apartheid government was forced to think out ever more stringent and oppressive laws to protect the Whites as the Black population continued to leapfrog in numbers year after year.

These laws - detention without trial, banning of books and people - were bad enough by themselves, but as the conflict intensified, both sides started using methods which would be shunned by any decent society. The Apartheid state used officially-funded death squads while police torture became routine; and the ANC placed bombs in restaurants, and encouraged mobs to necklace-murder collaborators, amongst other outrages.

In the name of a lie - that Apartheid could be sustained - the state caused, what were in anybody's book, morally repugnant acts to take place, on both sides of the political divide.

The Black resistance movements adopted a guerrilla hit-and-run policy of attacks on strategic targets. To combat this unconventional war, the South African Police were given extended powers of detention and other draconian measures - all of which could only be short-term fire-fighting measures, as the main issue - preventing majority Black occupation of the country, was never addressed

by any Apartheid laws.

The White government tried to give practical application to the policy of "Grand Apartheid". Independence was given to a number of traditional Black tribal homelands, the first in the mid-1970s.

In this way, the Apartheid government deluded itself into thinking that Black political aspirations could be satisfied in the exercise of voting for these tribal homelands, despite huge numbers of these tribe members living outside the borders of these states - in the so-called "White" urban areas (which in fact were not majority White at all, once the domestic servants, gardeners, shop workers, factory labourers, miners, drivers, shelf packers etc were counted in).

The White government also refused to adjust the size of these traditional tribal areas to fit in with the changed demographics, stubbornly insisting that the "Black Homeland" land area - some 13 percent of the country's surface area - could accommodate what was rapidly becoming over 80 percent of the total population, even if it contained much of the prime agricultural land, as was the case.

In a nutshell, the Apartheid government refused to accept the basic truth of racial dynamics: those who occupy a space determine the nature of the society in that space, regardless of to whom that space originally belonged.

White South Africa's fate was

sealed when the territorial division was not adjusted to fit in with the demographic realities; when all the effort was put into creating Black homelands and none put into creating a White "homeland", and the continued insistence upon the use of Black labour.

The partial reforms of the mid 1980s - which included the repealing of the laws forbidding mixed racial marriages and mixed racial political parties, combined with limited constitutional reforms which gave Indians and Coloureds their own parliamentary chambers, did nothing to stop the increasing violence.

In fact, racial violence increased dramatically: the reforms created an unfulfilled "revolution of rising expectations", and it was precisely during this cycle of Black violence and White counter violence that the racial war taking place inside the country exacted its highest death tolls ever.

In 1990, the White government finally faced the truth that it could no longer effectively control the ballooning Black population, unbanned the ANC and released Nelson Mandela from prison. By 1994, power had been handed over to the ANC in a one-man one-vote election - although strict Apartheid had ended in the 1980s, it is from 1994 that the policy is considered to have been laid to rest.

It was an inevitable result: Apartheid could not be maintained. It was in practical terms, unenforceable due to the demographic reality; and it was morally unacceptable as well, based as it was upon violent suppression.

White South Africans therefore sowed the seeds of their own downfall

with Apartheid, a system of segregation that could never be maintained in the face of their own use of Black labour.

Apartheid had to fall: the only question was when, not if. And the politicians who sold it to White South Africans as their only hope and salvation, lied - either deliberately, or out of ignorance of the reality of the relationship between demographics and power.

The fall of White South Africa was not due to fantastic conspiracies or betrayals, just due to the fact that Blacks had simply occupied the country out from under the Afrikaners' feet.

This occupation took place because White South Africa failed to understand that if they employed Black labour, then those Blacks would inevitably form the majority in that society, and ultimately - and rightly - demand political power.

The question therefore arises: given the current situation, can the Afrikaners be saved?

The answer is relatively simple:

- In a united South Africa, in which they are the perpetual minority, the answer is no.

- In a smaller region where Afrikaners form the majority population, the answer is yes.

No minority has every survived indefinitely in the face of a growing hostile majority, particularly one in South Africa where the material discrepancy between White and Black is so vast.

The only way in which Afrikaners can be saved, is if they come to understand the relationship between demographics and power: with no risk of ever repeating this critical point, namely, that those who occupy a territory, determine the nature of that territory.

Only once a majority of Afrikaners understand this truth, can there even begin to be talk of a practical plan for saving them from ultimate long-term extermination at the hands of the Third World.

Theoretically, if a majority of Afrikaners should come to this understanding, then it would be possible for Afrikaners to save themselves as no-one else is going to

save them.

Let us be positive and say that theoretically, Afrikaners did come to an understanding of the relationship between demographics and power politics.

Then they would stop wasting time blaming crackpot conspiracies for their downfall, stop dancing around wasting time playing party politics in a majority rule system in which they are just as doomed to failure as they were under Apartheid and start practically working towards creating a territory or region in which they become the demographic majority.


This would, *ipso facto* as a result of their small numbers, be a much smaller territory than the current area of South Africa. Where it would be, could be decided when and if that time ever comes: the only preconditions must be that it must be majority occupied by Afrikaners (like Israel was created by being majority occupied by Jews); and that those who settle there must be prepared to do their own labour.

There are immense problems in this, and this writer would be pleasantly surprised if the majority of Afrikaner farmers could in fact be persuaded to dispense with their hundreds of farm labourers and mechanise like their American counterparts; or if the majority of White South African households could be persuaded to make their own beds and wash their own dishes instead of using the plentiful 'maids', but that is another story.

Yes, this means gathering together the stock Afrikaner nation into a defined area. For example, (and this is just a theoretical example) if 500,000 Afrikaners settled in the old Eastern Transvaal, and physically occupied it, then this territory would *de facto*, and later even *de jure*, become an Afrikaner state.

The only way, then, that Afrikaners can be spared the fate of all first World minorities in Africa, is for them to abandon their dependence on non-white labour, accept that their salvation lies in a smaller territory, and finally by packing their bags and congregating in that smaller territory where they will form an outright demographic majority.

There is no other way: all else is chaff in the wind. History will tell if the Afrikaners have it within them to undertake this second Great Trek.



INEVITABLE: The tide turning



THE SECRET AGENT - Unmasking The Second Man

By Director of Group
Development Tony Lecomber

When the BBC documentary *The Secret Agent* was broadcast on July 15th of this year it became the top radio and TV news story of the day and was front page of *The Sun*. What stupendous scoop had it uncovered? Answer: in Britain's biggest racial hotspot, the BBC had discovered that some BNP members didn't like 'Pakis'! (as former residents of Pakistan are sometimes called). Aside from this revelation, plus exposure of a 'pooper squirter' and a member who had suffered years of anti-white harassment, which led him to become involved in a gang fight during which he beat up the leader of an Asian street gang, the programme was very thin.

Indeed, we know that privately BBC bosses were disappointed with the paucity of their material, which was the very best that could be had when it is considered that BBC undercover reporter Jason Gwynne was in place for six months. Working night and day hoping to harm the BNP, he was steered towards those most likely to provide a story by Bradford's BNP Organiser of the time, Andy Sykes, who was a paid agent for the left.

One thing in particular surprised me about that programme: the fact that the BBC knowingly exposed a paid agent for the left, Andy Sykes, thereby sacrificing a useful asset. At the same time, while watching the programme I realised two things, both related: first why they had done so; and second I was sure I had spotted his replacement on screen.

Sykes wanted out because he'd had enough that was plain for all to see. Nevertheless, his controllers would exert pressure for him to stay to: (a) provide them with more information; and (b) hinder the development of Bradford BNP. As part of this, Sykes admitted that he'd



THE SECOND MAN: Dave Midgely

stopped ten sensible candidates coming forward for the elections in June.

The only reason Bradford TUC (his controllers) would be happy for him to go was if they had a replacement. It was this replacement who I was sure I had spotted.

BBC'S ENDLESS RESOURCES

When allegations or claims were made within the programme, the BBC with its huge resources spared no effort in tracking down the information that would support further action to embarrass the party or its members who had been filmed unawares. A number of arrests have since been made, none of which have resulted in further action. When Steve Barkham boasted of fighting with Asians as part of a gang fight a couple of years before he joined the BNP, the BBC visited Bradford police to view their files and photo library. When news came in that Bradford TUC had a van packed with literature attacking the BNP, the BBC's man was there videoing BNP members taking a look.

Strangely absent was the lack of any further investigation into perhaps the most disgusting claim made on film: that of David Midgely, who boasted that he had used a children's water gun to suck up dog excreta

mixed up with water in a local park and then squirted it into a local restaurant, the Spicy Bites.

Midgely had also attracted my attention for another reason. He had, in front of the secret camera, encouraged the BNP's Mark Collett to tell him about a web site called RedWatch which posts up pictures and details of real and alleged left-wingers to cause them alarm and distress. Mark Collett, as many readers will remember, was the focus of another documentary a couple of years ago called *Young, Nazi and Proud*. It was the product of an extended interview by a known journalist. On camera, Mark gave a solid performance. What Mark didn't know, was that off camera, he was still on it.

As a result, the BBC might think of Mark as the obvious person to approach with any silliness like RedWatch. Midgely said that he had the picture of a local Bradford Councillor who in some way had 'done wrong' and was a worthy candidate for RedWatch. Midgely pressed Mark again and again. In the end, Mark explained what RedWatch did and said that if Midgely was so upset about it he should send them this Councillor's details, but that it was up to him. There this little vignette ended. It was hardly a ringing endorsement or promotion of RedWatch but, with the scarcity of

Excalibur

Winter 2004/5

Book Ends

These beautiful book-ends are part of a brand new range of items from Excalibur. They are of the highest quality and are made from hollow cast resin.
Height: 34cm approx.



£20 (inc. £4 p&p)



Viking Bust

Viking bust made from hollow cast resin. This Northman would take pride of place on any mantelpiece!

Height: 6.5"
Width: 5.5"

£14 (inc. £2 p&p)

Heart of Europe CD

Heart of Europe is a solo piano classical CD celebrating the masters of European music. 14 beautiful tracks including *Fuer Elise* by Beethoven, Debussy's *Girl with the Flaxen Hair*, and Liszt's *Liebestraum*. Over one hour of relaxing and inspiring classics.



£7 (inc. £1 p&p)

www.excaliburheritage.com

PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW
Enquiries@excaliburheritage.com

Tel: 07074 532267
www.bnp.org.uk



Coasters

Ornate Norse motif drinks coasters in a stylised holder.
(Contains 6 drinks coasters)

£12 (inc. £2 p&p)



Knight

Knight on horseback.
Made from hollow cast resin

Height: 35cm

£35 (inc. £5 p&p)



Warrior Lamp

Made from hollow cast resin.
Height: 77cm

£85 (inc. £10 p&p)

Joust Coat-Hooks

Height: 28cm

£27 (inc. £4 p&p)



For our full range and to pay using a credit card please see our website

Duvet Covers

Both designs available in single and double sizes.
Please specify design & size when ordering. Single: 138cm x 198cm & 1 pillowcase: sized 50cm x 75cm
Double: 200cm x 200cm & 2 pillowcases: sized 48cm x 73cm

£24 £41 (inc. p&p)
Single Double



How to Win an Election




Richards, P.
Pb, 111pp.

£16
(inc. p&p)

An excellent book dealing with the preparation, mechanics, tactics and strategy of winning elections at all levels. A must read for all organisers and activists!

The West, Islam & Islamisation



Cox, C. & Marks, J.
Pb, 127pp
2003

£6.50
(inc. p&p)

The conflict between the West and modern Islamism is documented here by discussing the writings of key Islamists including Osama Bin Laden.

Equal Opportunities or more opportunity?



Epstein, R.
Pb, 66pp
2003

£4.50
(inc. p&p)

Richard Epstein argues that current human rights laws, especially anti-discrimination statutes, create more injustices than they solve.

Race, Evolution & Behaviour




Rushton, J.
Pb, small format
2000

£3
(inc. p&p)

This book shows that there are at least three biological races of man, due to evolutionary and genetic, rather than social or cultural causes.

Tomorrow is Another Country




Harris, M.
Pb, 117pp
2003

£5.50
(inc. p&p)

Harris argues that, in order to regain control over our borders, the UK must repeal the Human Rights Act and devise a new immigration policy.

A Race Against Time




McDaniel, G. & Taylor, J.
Pb, 2003

£14.50
(inc. p&p)

This collection of articles by *American Renaissance* explains why Western man can save himself and his heritage only by returning to a better understanding of race and racial issues.

Great Tales from English History



Lacey, R.
Hb, 276pp
2003

£17
(inc. p&p)

This book captures some of the most pivotal moments of English history, and tells the stories of some of the extraordinary characters who helped shape a nation.

The Failure of Britain's Police



Dennis, N., Erdos, G. & Robinson, D.
Pb, 67pp
2003

£4.50
(inc. p&p)

Dennis compares crime and policing in London, once thought of as a safe city, and New York.

Stalin's War of Extermination



Hoffman, J.
Hb, 415pp
2001

£38
(inc. p&p)

This book establishes beyond all doubt that torture, murder, and rape of the captive and the helpless was official Soviet policy, as ordered by Churchill's wartime ally.

Another White Mug



£5.50 (inc. £1.50p p&p)

Tax Disc Holder



£1.50 (inc. 50p p&p)

Patriotic Pin Badges

£2.50 (inc. 50p p&p)



Please allow 28 days for delivery, although orders are generally sent out as soon as cheques clear. Goods paid for online or by postal order are not subject to a cheque-clearing delay and will generally be despatched on receipt of the order. Please note that we cannot accept credit card orders over the phone, but we are happy to accept them online at www.bnp.org.uk & www.excaliburheritage.com. Prices given here include p&p to the UK. For overseas prices please contact us or see our websites.

Order Form

Name..... Phone Number.....

Address.....

Postcode..... E-mail.....

Item	Quantity	Item	Quantity

I enclose a cheque/postal order (made payable to 'Excalibur') to the value of (For overseas prices please contact us)
Please send to Excalibur, PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW



material the BBC had on offer, it was the best that they were going to get.

I became suspicious of Midgley from that moment. Midgley pressed Mark on this point three or four times. He was clearly desperate for Mark to make a compromising answer. At the same time, for reasons of Mark's showing in the previous documentary, I didn't believe that the person Midgley chose to press on this subject was a coincidence, nor did I believe the fact that the presence of the secret camera was another coincidence.

Pretty much confirming me in this view was the BBC voice-over as this little episode ended informing us all that the Labour Councillor's picture and details were not, in the end, passed to RedWatch. Why had they said that? Why should they want to make it clear that a BNP man from the party that they were busy trying to discredit wasn't so bad after all? The answer surely was because they wanted to clear their man, Midgley, from having passed information to RedWatch and thereby not attract the attention of the police or the left.

STILL A MOLE LEFT

Aside from the RedWatch episode, there was always the question of why the BBC had exposed an asset. It had never been done before. The obvious answer was that there was still another left in place. True that didn't point directly at Midgley, but it was suggestive that there was still a mole within Bradford BNP.

In the aftermath of *The Secret Agent* programme I spoke to a number of people within Bradford BNP and found that Andy Sykes had resisted attempts to sideline ineffective individuals and was also pretty useless himself, and we now know why. David Midgley, it transpired, was also someone whose 'help' the party could easily do without. A self-touted computer 'expert', Midgley's 'expertise' was so poor that Bradford BNP could not use any of his work, which was always late and muddled. A clean start had to be made again once he'd been suspended after the programme.

While the RedWatch episode and the asset exposure gave a reasonable possibility that Midgley was a mole, the clincher came with the pooper squirter episode. It has to be said that Midgley's disgusting behaviour was one of the

worst aspects of the whole programme. During the course of the programme, Midgley gave a detailed account of how he had obtained and squirted dog poop into the Spicy Bites takeaway and then made the quip: "Spicy Bites, Shite Bites".

Question: Why, when the BBC had gone to all the trouble of locating police photos of the Bradford riots etc, did they not go to the owner of the Spicy Bites for a tear-jerking account from the proprietor of how Midgley had spoilt his business, following it up with the usual voice-over informing us all of the crime that had been committed along with the penalty? Answer: because it never happened! Midgley was a turncoat who had merely said that he had squirted this stuff into the Spicy Bites to make him sound 'a bit of a racist'; thinking that would make him 'fit in' and give him 'credibility'. What happened, of course, was that the BNP immediately started disciplinary proceedings against both him and Steve Barkham who had boasted of his part in a gang fight. To his credit, Barkham went immediately, but Midgley chose to contest the issue.

ATTACK DID NOT HAPPEN

Subsequent to the programme, David Midgley said in conversations with BNP officials that he hadn't squirted anything into the Spicy Bites at all. As proof of this, he went to speak to the owner of the Spicy Bites, a man named 'Shaf', and taped him with his consent. Shaf confirmed that no such incident had taken place. Furthermore, Shaf said that the programme had damaged his business and that he was in the middle of taking action against the BBC for lost earnings.

It is not the case that the BBC did not show the interview with Shaf about the pooper squirter episode because it simply failed to substantiate Midgley's claims. Don't forget, the BBC were very careful to exonerate Midgley from sending pictures to RedWatch. The truth is that they did not even bother to send anyone to interview him because they knew from the start it was a bogus claim (police involvement in the matter was therefore a non-issue). And the proof of all this? The taped recording from Midgley himself which he believed would get him off the hook from the party's internal disciplinary proceedings. The tape of Shaf talking

to David Midgley is not revealing for what it says, but for what it does not say.

What the tape should have recorded is Shaf denying that such an incident took place (which he did) and in the next breath saying that the BBC had come to interview him over the matter. However, he did not say the BBC had come to interview him for the simple reason that they had not, but considering the legal action he was contemplating against the BBC he would surely not have forgotten to mention this, had it occurred, as it would form an important plank of his case against them. No, the BBC never went to speak to Shaf in the Spicy Bites because they knew that David Midgley's claims were false. Midgley's tape recording, which he thought would get him off the hook, proved it by omission.

The BNP can be pleased that another mole has been spotted and dealt with.

Last month, a BNP internal disciplinary hearing sat to hear the Midgley case. The probability that he was a mole was not at issue and nor was it discussed. The hearing was only considering the negative impact upon the party of his claims of squirting dog poop into an Asian takeaway. David Midgley offered no sensible explanation of why he had said this. The panel found him guilty unanimously and voted to expel him from the BNP by a majority decision.

BNP Lottery Winners

Prize winners in the latest BNP lottery (all profits to Party funds) are as follows:


1. Clive West, Dewsbury. Family holiday in Florida, USA.
2. David Charlwood, Brighton. £500.
3. Mrs M. Cooper, Tewkesbury. £100
4. Peter Jarvis, Leicester. Solid teak classic Roberts radio.
5. Mr S. Harris, Maryport, Cumbria. One year subscription to *Voice of Freedom and Identity*.

If you have NOT been able to get BNP lottery tickets before, contact Kenny Smith, PO Box 5674, Inverness, IV27YL.



The Continuing Assaults On The British National Party

By BNP webmaster, Steve Blake
Bsc (Hons), Msc



Behind the web - a major internet server

Attacks on the BNP Website

The website of the party has proven to be a major tool for providing information to members, supporters and curious undecided members of the electorate. It also helps raise funds through online donations, sales of merchandise and publication subscriptions.

According to independent web monitoring services such as Alexa and Hitwatch it is the most popular political website in the UK.

Clearly this effective presence of the patriotic British voice on the Internet was too much for those of our political opponents who do not care for free speech. On Friday 8th October the web server which hosts our web site suffered a sustained hostile attack by what is termed "denial of service", leading to the server being closed down by our hosting providers.

They then set up a new server (computer) to host our material. Within a matter of 18 hours however this backup server also came under attack and the hosting providers again had no choice but to take the server offline. This was a devastating decision for the service provider which had several hundred other commercial customers affected by this attack and prompted our hosts to inform the American FBI.

The BNP Internet team quickly launched a reserve domain name. The presence of this website *www.bnp.to* was broadcast to many of our members through our email newsletter, word of mouth through our branch and on websites of friends and associates of the BNP all round the world, to whom we are extremely grateful.

The Denial of Service (DoS) attack is a serious criminal matter and our former hosting providers have proven to be extremely co-operative in identifying the source of the attack. Traceability is certainly possible, with both the FBI and the Computer Crimes Unit of the Metropolitan Police now on the case. Under legislation in both the US and the UK, the attack of this nature is classed as an act of

terrorism and penalties for such an attack are severe.

We suspect a number of related events on or around Thursday 7th October were significant in the timing of the attack upon our site, including our excellent recent local election results and most importantly:

1. BNP member Jay Lee received news that he and the BNP legal department has won his epic legal case against the ASLEF trade union in the Employment Tribunal.

The Tribunal held unanimously that Mr. Lee had been unlawfully expelled from ASLEF for his membership of the BNP. This verdict means that Mr. Lee is now entitled to claim thousands of pounds in compensation and costs from ASLEF.

The verdict opens the door to scores of similar cases and may lead to serious financial issues for some unions in terms of the cost of compensation. It also throws into doubt the credibility of those union leaders who have sanctioned expulsions of BNP members.

2. The fact that the official BNP website is now a credited "news source" for the Google search tool must have also come as a shock to our multiculturalist opponents. It seems that due to the huge Internet audience that is seeking out the official BNP website the Google search tool has recognised our site to be a source of valuable news items. This has the potential to boost our visitor numbers dramatically.

The good news is that the attack has forced us to take steps which will significantly improve our internet presence. We have put together a strategy which will mean that very shortly we will have a very robust and secure system. We have purchased, at considerable cost, our very own web server which will be hosted by a Florida-based company which boasts an impeccable record in terms of online security. In addition we will have copies of the BNP site material on a number of other Internet servers ensuring that it makes it almost impossible for our opponents and those that seek to destroy Britain to take us off air ever again.

HSBC Close BNP Accounts

The HSBC Bank has joined the growing list of supposedly independent and non-political organisations to put Political Correctness and profit before free speech. HSBC's decision to close down a number of British National Party bank accounts was announced in a letter sent to the party's national treasurer on 18th October;

"The HSBC Group is strictly non-political with deeply ingrained traditions of multiculturalism and diversity. The Bank recognises the legal rights of political organisations and other associations, including their freedom to express their views and opinions. However, it also reserves its own



HSBC



Hate Supporting British Culture

right to decline to provide its services to organisations whose value systems, it considers, are markedly different from its own."

The closure of a number of national and regional accounts by the HSBC follows an identical move several months ago by Barclays, and the refusal of the Alliance & Leicester to allow the party to open accounts via its Post Office operation – despite the fact that Post Office accounts are supposed to be available to everyone.

As John Walker, BNP National Treasurer, told Identity, however, "we knew that HSBC would come under the same pressure as Barclays and would surrender just as quickly. So we had already opened our other accounts to which we can switch the tens of thousands of pounds involved at the drop of a hat.

"Equally, though, we expect to lose those accounts in due course, and now the Electoral Commission has confirmed that, under these extraordinary circumstances, they will allow us to bank abroad, we are making suitable arrangements for the future."

This latest move to deny us the banking facilities that every other party takes for granted, and without which any party would be enormously disadvantaged, is only the latest in a wave of attacks on all fronts which are clearly designed, in the words of the threat by the former head of Scotland Yard's Anti-Terrorist Squad John Grieve, "to close the BNP down by all administrative means."

Credit for the Barclays and HSBC decisions has been claimed by several Islamic groups, and certainly the fact that the HSBC was the first bank to discriminate against white customers by offering no-interest Islamic mortgages to Muslims in Britain is an indicator of just how much money its top executives believe they can make in the Islamic world.

But there is more than pressure from a few noisy Muslims at work here. When the BNP Legal Department's Lee Barnes telephoned his counterpart in the HSBC the latter responded to mention of a possible future Human Rights Act challenge with a dismissive laugh and the comment that "you chaps don't even have a solicitor to represent you now."

Sad, but true at the time, because the solicitor we have been using for several years had just weeks before had his licence to practice revoked by the legal closed shop following a groundless and vexatious complaint and a subsequent outrageously biased and dishonest investigation of his affairs by the Law Society. Several other solicitors approached were either unwilling to risk the wrath of the powerful 'minorities' and PC leftists who

infest the British legal system or, amazingly, had either been persecuted by the Law Society for acting for nationalists in the past, or found themselves under threat within days of our establishing a friendly contact.

The key question, however, is how someone in HSBC's Legal Department knew that fact? The obvious answer is that they had been reassured that they could close down our accounts without any threat of redress because "the BNP has been stripped of its legal defences." And who would know that? Not a bunch of crazy Mullahs, that's for sure!

No, the plain truth is that we are now partway into a carefully co-ordinated step-by-step campaign intended to block, marginalise, criminalise, disable and ban - *de facto* if not *de jure* - the British National Party. This campaign is being organised not by Muslim activists or far left cranks (though both groups are clearly being used by the serious enemies of democracy) but by senior members of the Government, hand-in-hand with powerful accomplices in the security forces, the police and the mass media.

It is essential that we do not respond to this pressure by losing our heads and either becoming despondent or angry enough to lash out and give them fresh ammunition to use in their media and legal assaults.

But it is vital that we understand that the era of straightforward political contest on a basically level playing field is at an end. In its place we are now moving into a Civil Rights struggle. Election campaigns will continue to be vitally important – in fact winning council by-elections is the best possible defence against the State's marginalisation campaign – but we will have to learn to win them at the same time as running noisy, militant demonstrations, imaginative publicity stunts and non-violent direct action such as pickets and sit-ins.

These do not come without cost, however, and the money for the extra organisation, fines and from time to time and supporting the families of BNP prisoners of conscience will be extra to that required to keep on winning elections in the teeth of opponents who are steadily raising their own campaigning to match that of ours.

The challenges facing us are enormous. But they are the product of our opponents' fear and their recognition of our almost unlimited potential. Look at things from their point of view: They throw all these things at us, but we keep coming back and winning. Blows which would knock them out are shrugged off, or even turned to our advantage. We must be the scariest political phenomenon they've ever seen. Well, they ain't seen nothing yet!



John Bean's Nationalist Notebook

Immigration Will Add Six Million In 30 Years

The latest forecasts from the Government Actuary's Department (GAD) confirm the earlier claims made by Migrationwatch UK (pooh-poohed at the time by the liberal-left) that immigration will add six million to Britain's population over the next three decades. No wonder John Prescott's plans to concrete over more of rural East Anglia and other South Eastern counties to erect another half million houses were given the go-ahead last month! He also wants another 200,000 homes to be built in Thames Gateway, Ashford in Kent and the south Midlands. And it won't stop there.

According to the GAD report, the official estimates for immigration are based on an assumption of 130,000 arrivals a year. But it makes no allowance for recent government policies designed to *stimulate* immigration, nor does it include the numerous failed asylum seekers and their dependants allowed to remain in the country.

As Migrationwatch says: "About 50,000 people a year are detected attempting to enter Britain illegally. If a similar number succeed (a low estimate) a further half million should be added each decade, *or more if allowance is made for their descendants.*" (Our emphasis.)

The above information came from a report on page 2 of the *Daily Telegraph* of October 2nd. Its front page heading was: "Cut taxes and we'll vote Tory". The report that followed gave details of a YouGov poll it had commissioned asking floating voters which policies were most likely to persuade them to vote Tory. Actually, the tax issue came second with 37%. First, was curbing immigration with 47%. Then why did the *Telegraph* not put this in their heading? It is symptomatic of what the voters can expect in regard to any effective handling by the Tories, or their mouthpieces, of the most important issue affecting our future.

We would suggest that even Migrationwatch's figures are very much under estimated. Earlier a Home Office official admitted in court that immigration could be running **six** times higher than the official figures, that he couldn't even "guesstimate" the true number of foreign nationals living in Britain, and that the number of routes into Britain for illegal entrants was "unbelievable".

Revise our heading to: "Immigration Will Add Six Million in Ten Years".

EU Whistle-blower Fired By Neil Kinnock

There is a reek of corruption about so many activities of the EU's Brussels 'Commissars' that the sacking of Marta Andreasen, the former chief accountant, for refusing to withdraw her warnings of the risk of widespread fraud receives only passing mention in the media. She has amassed more than 100 papers that she believes will shed new light on the EU's poor accounting practices. Some of the documents are so sensitive that she has stored them in a bank vault for safe-keeping.

She has described the EU's book-keeping as "Enron-

style" and told the press that its £63 billion budget was "an open till waiting to be robbed".

The heart of Mrs Andreasen's complaint is that the commission lacks double-entry book-keeping, now routine in the private sector, allegedly making it possible to divert large sums of money without leaving an electronic fingerprint. She found a £130 million discrepancy between two sets of books for 2001, which has never been fully explained.

The outgoing European Commission that sacked her, without compensation, was guided by Neil Kinnock, the EU's reform commissioner and former Labour Party leader. The charge they made was that she had committed an "irredeemable breach of trust" by going public with her claims.

In an interview that Mrs Andreasen gave to David Wastell of the *Sunday Telegraph* (17.10.04), at the hearing in front of 24 commissioners, headed by Mr Kinnock, she looked directly at Mr Kinnock as she told them that she found it strange how, five years into his reform programme, the Commission's computer system was still "incoherent". He appeared agitated, she said, making "a lot of gestures".

The actions of this former scion of the Old Labour Party call to mind some of the parodies of the *Red Flag* that we used to sing in my political youth; "*The working class can kiss my arse, I've got an EU job at last.*"

Anglo Saxon Invasion a Myth!

One of the few good trends in our TV programming are the increasing number dealing with our history, even if some try to make it politically correct - with the exception of Dr David Starkey in his excellent new series. One such programme was the series on Channel 4 on *King Arthur's Britain*. This was well presented and made the telling point that in the so-called 'Dark Ages' after the departure of the Romans in the early 5th century, in contrast to perceived opinion Romano-Celtic Britain developed a culture superior to most of Europe. Then came the final part dealing with the arrival of the Anglo Saxons.

My view on this was succinctly summed up in a letter I received from Marina Smethurst, an *Identity* reader in Cardiganshire. What is more is that the following passages from her letter saves me a little time in writing it myself!

The programme's research included, she wrote, the excavation of 'Anglo Saxon' burials in England, examination of 'Anglo Saxon' artefacts, plus physical and genetic evidence that those buried in what was referred to as an 'Anglo Saxon' cemetery had originated in northern Europe, namely the area of modern day Holland and north Germany. Old maps of the seven Anglo Saxon kingdoms which later came together to form England were also shown. All well and good so far!

However, the presenter then went on to claim that the Anglo Saxon invasion or migration never actually took place and was all an invention of the Victorians.

He even claimed that no battles had been recorded, even though there was still an educated Latin-speaking Romanised population in Britain at that time who did do so. This included the battles against the Saxons at Aylesford and Crayford, which are well documented. The presenter even said that the forts of the Saxon shore were not built as defence works by the Romans, but were used for some kind of storage. Pretty impressive warehouses, what!

The question of why the English language is descended from Anglo Saxon (a Germanic language) was explained away by saying - unbelievably - that the natives had simply decided to change their language! It was also claimed that though there are few Celtic words in modern English, the word order is very much like that of the Celtic languages. Well, anyone with even a little knowledge of Welsh will tell you that is not true.

All in all it seemed as if the powers that be, having viewed the programme, decided that its message was politically incorrect and that their aim should be to destroy the sense of English identity rather than strengthen it. The liberal elite must be very confident that after thirty years of 'modern' teaching methods the English are now too stupid to see the inconsistencies and downright contradictions in the programme.

Is English identity now illegal? We know it is politically incorrect, though Welsh and Scottish nationalism is OK.

All I would add to Marina Smethurst's observations above is that it is true to say that the Anglo Saxons did not all arrive at once with Hengist and Horsa, but mainly in family and tribal groups over a period of a century or more. They probably never outnumbered the Celts, not all of whom decided to 'retire' to Wales and Cornwall. Thus to this day, DNA tests show that there is very little genetic difference between a Celt from Wales and an East Anglian, for example, of today.

Subtle Ethnic Cleansing in East London

A report by Nick Craven in the *Daily Mail* of October 2nd provided ample factual evidence of the manner in which large sectors of our inner cities are being subjected to ethnic cleansing, albeit in a subtle form, with the original British finding life more tolerable by moving out.

A whole page of the report was occupied by an aerial photograph of a nameless street in Newham, East London, with a key to each house having a flag denoting the nationality of the inhabitants. Of the 63 houses only five had English inhabitants. Apart from one Italian, one Spanish and one Portuguese family, the rest were Afro-Asian, predominantly from Pakistan and Bangladesh. We were reminded in the report that Newham has the country's youngest population and the third worst unemployment rate 52% - in England and Wales.

One inhabitant was a Kosovan farm labourer who came here in 1998 with a wife and three children. Nick Craven wrote: "He lives on benefit due to heart disease, has been granted refugee status and has his rent paid. He says: 'Britain is a good place.'"

The Italian, who came here as a child in 1961, said: "Things have changed. There are some good people round here, but others haven't got any respect and the area's getting worse."

Nick Craven said that one recurring theme was the growing menace of street violence, with gangs of usually Bengali youths hanging around on corners after dark and abusing or menacing passers-by. He mentioned an Indian Hindu woman whose two teenage sons needed hospital treatment after being attacked, not because of their colour, but their religion.

"We went to the Mosque to complain to the elders," she said. "But they dismissed us and we got little help from the police either."

She and her family plan to move. "We'll probably go to Chigwell or somewhere, a white area," she said.

Blair to Invade Africa?

Early last month Tony Blair dodged some of the flak arising from the final disclosures that Saddam never did have any "weapons of mass destruction" by departing to Africa for a few days. Here he showed a lack of historical knowledge and a complete lack of military sense with an inane suggestion that "battle groups", led by British troops seconded to the new Euro-Army, could soon deploy to Africa to sort out their problems!

There is possibly a case for sparing a battalion of British troops under British command (not Brussels) to go to Zimbabwe in support of the legally elected opposition to Mugabe, the Movement For Democratic Change, but that is all.

We have 9,000 servicemen bogged down in the folly of the Iraq intervention - with the Black Watch taking more casualties in the townships they have taken over from the Americans - and several others scattered around eight other global locations so Blair can make his newsworthy contributions to "protecting" international (not British) interests.

His touch of megalomania overlooks the fact that his Chancellor's savage defence cuts mean that we do not have the ships, the planes, the men, or the money to meet our existing obligations.

"Funny Looks" in Village Shops

Is there no end to the arrogance of the Guyanese-born Trevor Phillips, chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality? His latest abuse of the native Britons comes with his complaint that there are very few ethnic minorities in the countryside and that those that do get out to the country feel that they are in a "foreign land" and get "funny looks" in village shops. Well, white people in certain parts of Bradford, Oldham or Leicester also get "funny looks", but not a word from Marxist Phillips about that. Then we have to consider that a growing number of the rural population are 'white flighters', refugees from the cities where they had more than their fill about the joys of living in a multiracial society, although many of these brainwashed Brits will not admit it. Their looks at any rural ethnic incomers are likely to be more 'anxious' than "funny".

No doubt the next thing we will be hearing from the racial Witch Finder General, Trevor Phillips (receiving £93,000 a year from us taxpayers), is that rural Britain is 'institutionally racist'.



Nov 2004

THE AN

ASYLUM IN BRITAIN

crowded classrooms

asylum

crowded classrooms

ASYLUM SEEKERS

Readers' Letters

Speakers' Corner

PO Box 97, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8WT, England. E-mail: identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk

LETTER OF THE MONTH

>> Canvassing Problems To Be Overcome

Tony Lecomber is quite right that lack of canvassing was the cause of the relatively poor election results in some areas this year. But does Tony realise how difficult it can be for us ordinary mortals to face the hostility one receives from a small minority of the public?

I did not canvass for the election (I stood in Royston in Barnsley) but I did distribute over 11,500 BNP leaflets in my target ward over 12 months. While distributing these leaflets I had a total of 16 people coming out of their houses shouting abuse, and on several occasions approaching me in a threatening manner. Only my high level of motivation ensured that I continued with my task.

So Tony, if you are wondering why many Organisers did not canvass take note of my experiences and also consider the following:

1. Several of my friends and acquaintances totally believe in the BNP but are afraid to join. Many people will believe that having joined the Party they have been brave enough and need not do any more.

2. I took the further step of promoting the Party

and I found this required a high level of commitment.

3. I could not summon up the courage to go one step further and actually knock on doors to promote the Party.

I think Tony should recognise that most people don't have the superior mental toughness and indomitable strength of character that he and the rest of the BNP leadership possess. This may seem a negative attitude but it would help if he were to be more sympathetic to the difficulty of canvassing for some people and perhaps investigate solutions. There may be psychological techniques that one could use to counter the hostility, for example.

As canvassing is so important to the Party perhaps a series of articles on canvassing techniques or an official BNP canvassing crib sheet would help. A few light hearted anecdotes about canvassing may also make the task seem less daunting.

Paul Harris
Barnsley

>> Support From All Types

While walking my dogs recently I got talking to a woman. It started with chit-chat, but she then went on to bemoan the fact that she and her parents had worked all their lives, etc, and she was thoroughly pissed at the fact that "parasites can come over here, be given priority" etc; no law and order, blah, blah.

Later that day I was in conversation with an elderly man who complained that after a lifetime's work on LRT (London Transport) his taxes had left him with little of his pension but yet there is money to house, feed, educate, give unlimited health care to, and distribute luxuries (that he as

a pensioner cannot afford) to asylum seeking spongers over the heads of hard working, BRITISH people. He finished his conversation with: "I really want to vote for the BNP". Although a member of this great party for some years, I failed to take their names and addresses, due to the fact they were Black.

It really is a shame that we cannot find a way to get these people, mainly West Indians, on our side as a lot of them that I meet reiterate exactly what we as a party advocate. I am by no means suggesting that we open party membership to any one other than white people, nor am I advocating a drop in our standard of policies (God forbid). However, I would suggest that it would be a good

idea if we could put across to certain members of the non-white community the message that we will not put them up against a wall and shoot them or in any other way commit harm against their race. Some of them would love a good financial package to return to their land of origin, which is part of our policy.

I may be wrong but I simply acknowledge that a lot of these people share our views on many important issues and if their voice could be expressed through the form of a vote for us then not only would it make our success that much sooner, but would also counter the establishment propaganda that the BNP are only 'race-haters'.

Finally, in case any 'stirrers' want



to take this the wrong way, we should never detract from saying that we wish this country to be predominantly one for white/Anglo-Saxon/Celtic/Western European peoples.

Frank Forte
London

>> No To Blood Sports

So John Bean was out with the Countryside Alliance defending the 'rights' of the blood sport enthusiasts. He was correct when he says there are many in the BNP who are keen on animal welfare and his comments were damaging. Our *Freedom* newspaper in October was more concerned with animal issues, e.g. banning pork imports, the cruel Halal ritual slaughter of animals for Islam, etc, and was spot on. Bring back our freedoms and respect the wishes of the people. The majority want an end to hunting as it belongs in the dark ages, along with ducking stools, burning witches, cock fighting etc. Animal welfare won Labour massive support in the last two elections. It can do wonders for the BNP.

Stuart Robinson
Halifax

The BNP is a broad church, Stuart, and many of us can have different views on social customs. The way I read October *Freedom's* comment on fox hunting was that it was the same as mine; we should respect the rights of those who wish to pursue this tradition even if we do not hunt ourselves. Incidentally, in my household we only buy British (preferably local Suffolk) pork, free range eggs and refuse to touch factory farmed poultry. - *John Bean*

>> And No To Shechita Killing

Tony Blair promised the "Labour Friends of Israel" that he would ignore any moves to outlaw the Shechita method of animal slaughter used by Jews, despite large scale support within Parliament for recommendations made by the Farm Animals Welfare Council to outlaw the practice.

Government sources involved in

the consultation process have already indicated that they are satisfied that "on balance, animals, especially cattle, slaughtered without pre-stunning are likely to experience very significant pain and distress". Despite this, Blair promised the powerful Jewish lobby group: "While it would be not right for me to pre-empt the outcomes of the consultation process, I would like to make it clear that nothing will come out of the consultation that will threaten your religious rights and freedoms".

Well, it seems that just like the British people, animals have no rights in Blair's Britain!

Dr Louisa Beckett-Smith
Halesowen

>> The Main Immigration Threat

In his September issue article about a demographic bomb ticking away in our midst, Philip Smeeton correctly warns that the main threat we face is that from the law-abiding majority of Third World immigrants who have successfully settled and prospered in Britain and other Western European countries. I hope that the BNP will heed this warning and not keep over emphasising that law-abiding ethnics can stay here.

L.J.Irving
Plymouth

>> Terrorists as 'British' Citizens

The Bishop of Oxford recently warned that between 1986-88 one fifth of the telephone calls made by Osama Bin Laden were to people in the UK. Further, he said that al-Qaeda have links to over 80 countries and significant bases here. In a recent radio interview the former MI5 spy David Shayler revealed that in the early 1990s MI5 allowed thousands of al-Qaeda terrorists into this country. There is apparently nothing that can be done about this now as most of them have become British citizens.

Apart from the obvious stupidity of allowing such people in to help create a multiracial society and then bombing the homes of their co-

religionists back in their own countries, why are we told to wait to be blown up yet, at the same time, face the prospect of arrest for Islamophobia if we say too much about these potential terrorists!? I suggest that the heads of our police forces and those politicians who instruct them are being treasonable in protecting the enemies of our country who are planning to kill and maim us.

Humphrey Gittens
West Midlands

>> Keep England 'English'?

I see that the English Democrats Party (who got a paltry 43 votes in the Hartlepool by-election) apparently want to keep England English but are unconcerned as to the ethnic make-up of its inhabitants. In its literature it states that membership is open to any person "irrespective of their religion or race". If England became 40% Asian it would be ridiculous to expect the 'rights of England', its 'standards, values and way of life' to be upheld by the newcomers. A similar stance is adopted by UKIP.

R.Tandy
Norfolk

>> Baltic Nationalists

I have recently spent a month out in Latvia and Estonia and, contrary to some negative talk within the BNP about Eastern Europeans, found the locals to be natural BNP supporters. They are as anti-immigration as one could imagine, and being unsullied by our decades of political correctness they call a spade a spade in graphic terms. (Their EU delegates must make the usual liberals in Brussels blanch). Most Easterners say that their reason for not travelling to the UK for work (it is a big temptation) is the number of blacks in this country. The Baltic nationalists got 40% of the vote in the last elections. They are great people. English seems to be their first language and I think we would find some natural allies over there.

Ralph Ellis
e-mail



Nov 2004

Environment

The Birth of Eco-Conflict and its Danger to The West

Lee Barnes looks at the damaging effects the proposed EU changes to the 1951 Geneva Convention on Refugees could have for the nations of Europe, with up to 200 million 'Environmental Refugees' flooding in by 2050.

In the *Sunday Times* of September 5th 2004 the European Union's incoming Justice Minister, Rocco Buttiglione, stated that the 1951 Geneva Convention on Refugees may be changed to include the concept of 'Environmental Refugees' and thereby allow up to 50 million 'Eco-Refugees' into Europe by 2010 and up to 150 million more by 2050.

According to the Red Cross 'environmental refugees' now number 25 million people, 58% of the total worldwide population of refugees. Although the 1951 Geneva Convention was drafted in order to provide assistance solely for those internal citizens of Europe who were displaced as a result of World War Two, it is now about to be used to destroy Europe itself through the process of Eco-Conflict which will allow unlimited immigration into the West.

Eco-Conflict describes the process by which people take either collective action (non-violent protest or violent rebellion) or individual acts of protest or terror against governments or other groups, when they perceive that their individual or familial well being or national or ethnic group survival is threatened by environmental change, mass immigration or unequal access

to scarce resources. Aspects of Eco-Conflict can renew old intra-national conflicts, substantially protract ongoing ones or create new intra-ethnic conflict as a result of mass immigration into a nation.

Resource scarcity as an issue can lead to three types of conflict: simple scarcity conflict (where at least two states or groups engage in violent conflict or warfare); group identity conflict (where groups are displaced from a resource-scarce region to another region, resulting in tension and conflict); or relative deprivation conflict (where one group feels deprived of a resource relative to other groups).

What is broadly labeled as 'environmental security matters', according to various theories, involves environmental change, i.e. the decline in the quantity or quality of renewable resources that occurs faster than the renewal of that resource by natural processes and the use of technological processes. This has its political, economic, social and humanitarian consequences. This includes population-induced ecological stress, land scarcity, ethnic conflict, the depletion of water supplies, deforestation, desertification, air/water/land

pollution, ozone depletion, climate change, natural catastrophes, energy security, nuclear safety issues, famine, diseases and migration (immigration pressures and refugee flows), intra-national conflict, terrorism, the removal of civil rights, the creation of Eco-Dictatorships and the breakdown of the social order of nations.

These issues have the potential to influence greatly the future of the planet, and because they directly lead to a serious and irreversible decline in the quality of people's life and new political tension at the national, regional and global levels, their implications are of utmost interest to national security.

Thus, both British Nationalists, European Nationalist parties and the British public should be more aware of the significance of the role of environmental change among the other more traditionally recognised (political, economic and social) issues that threaten the stability of Britain, Europe and the planet.

Environmental change can generate displaced communities (i.e. environmental refugees) and environmentally induced Eco-Conflicts.

The Nine Stages of social breakdown that lead to Eco-Conflict

are plotted below:

Stage I (Overpopulation Pressure).

Population pressures increase due to dense human settlements, and today stem from high birth rates of immigrants (the birth rates of the racially British people are falling below replacement levels), increasing urbanisation, and the continuing influx of foreign migrants. This causes intra-ethnic violence in the host communities that have to 'absorb' the new migrants and a corresponding adoption of ever more draconian laws by national states to stem this tide of protest against mass immigration by the indigenous people.

As the laws on free speech and assembly are restricted to counter public protests the 'anger' of the citizens manifests itself more and more in urban street conflict. In Britain we have already begun to witness this in places such as Bradford, Peterborough and Oldham, where relations between the indigenous population and immigrants (as well as among different racial groups of immigrants) have reached 'crisis point' according to the Home Office.

Stage II (Growing Demands).

As population increases so does the level of human activities. This includes the growth per capita of resource consumption, the demand for a higher standard of living and the escalating production of biological and industrial wastes. Additionally, the average individual's level of consumption or affluence is raised further by resource

consumption and pollution-generating technology development: This level of growth is unsustainable. As more and more people are forced to drop into poverty as the breaking point approaches in regard to sustainability their expectations of affluence and more income are simultaneously being raised. This generates frustration; frustration turns to rage, rage turns to hate, hate turns to war.

Stage III (Environmental Stress).

Increasing mass immigration and its growing demands on the nation increase resource shortages and environmental damage through a vicious cycle. When the resource supply becomes scarce or less accessible, then it requires excessively high costs and greater environmental damage in order to provide resources for the additional people. This accelerates the breakdown in the environment and effectively destroys the 'natural resource base' for future generations. In order to sustain the people of the present we must poison or starve the children of the future.

Stage IV (Competition and Tension).

Environmental stress, including scarcities and degradation, instigate competition among the affected population (local people and migrants) within a society, generating political and social tension. During times of competition over ecological resources the affected country's people usually become more self-conscious and self-assertive of their group identity. This is

already happening in Britain. As the resources of the country diminish in the coming decades then more tensions will be raised.

Already in 2004 we have for the first time become mainly dependent on foreign energy sources to power our national economy. Our North Sea oil supplies are almost gone, the coal mines have been closed and our economy is now dependent on Russian gas and Arabian oil. In 2003 60,000 pensioners died in their own homes, many from hypothermia, and in the coming years this will rise even more.

The BNP as a political party will continue to rise in strength and power whilst traditional parties, both Left and Right, will become obsolete. Identity Politics will grow in power. As a result of 'Multiculturalism' this movement towards 'Identity Politics' has already been encouraged, though so far only for immigrants who have been encouraged to organise collectively as a community to demand ever more resources from the indigenous community. The British state has, at the same time as encouraging identity politics movements for immigrant groups, actively attempted to undermine the basic civil rights of the indigenous people of Britain and prevent them asserting their inalienable right to an 'Identity' driven political party and movement.

Further attempts to inhibit this growth will lead to more tensions on the streets, leading to violent outbreaks of disorder. Positive discrimination policies in favour of immigrants in Britain will lead to further trouble as the indigenous population are driven further down the 'Social Pyramid' into poverty whilst they are forced to watch as immigrant communities are given ever more resources to appease them before they seek to confront the State and demand more resources by force.

Stage V (Distribution Disorder).

Growing competition over scarce resources places governments under heavy stress concerning the 'orderly' distribution of insufficient resources among an increasing population. The greater the scarcity, the more likely is a breakdown of the distribution order. This is because advantaged groups, often including government elite members and cosseted minority

HEADED THIS WAY: Endless streams of 'refugees'





groups composed of immigrants, wield their power to monopolise the ever diminishing resources of the state and nation at the expense of other groups, mostly the indigenous population. This exacerbates internal conflicts and increases the political necessity of an 'Identity Politics' based British National Party for the indigenous British people in order to ensure they are not unfairly penalised for their lack of an 'Identity Politics' political party. This will also further reveal and increase the futility of the obsolete old parties such as Labour, Liberal Democrat and the Conservatives based on the traditional 'right and left' ideologies, or the purely 'national independence' issues in relation to the European Union of UKIP.

Stage VI (Environmental Destruction).

Without appropriate measures to prevent overuse and pollution of renewable resources, ecological stress passes a threshold of irreversibility. Even if the environmental condition is partially reversible, it will be a prohibitively long and costly process. This is what we are witnessing in the North Sea right now in relation to fish stocks, particularly cod. Over-fishing has resulted in damage that, if not irreversible, will take decades to undo.

Stage VII (Economic Decline).

Environmental destruction, such as depletion of fish stocks, decreases agricultural and industrial production and causes a lowering of average living standards and further impoverishment and malnutrition within developed societies. The spectres of disease and famine once more haunt the West as the Golden Era of the promise of perpetual economic 'progress' comes to an end.

More and more citizens are cast into penury as wages and living standards fall. Social cohesion breaks down and the state degenerates into an 'Eco-Dictatorship' where order and stability in the nation are imposed through the utilisation of para-military police, the army and the removal of basic civil rights and freedoms.

Stage VIII (Social Disintegration).

Normally, environmental destruction and economic woes have the following social effects before producing violent

conflict: disruption of authoritative political, financial, and legal institutions and accepted social relations; the spread of relative deprivation and frustration due to unequal distribution of both ecological resources and economic goods; and population displacement including mass migration of rural workers into cities or across national borders.

Another feature is the importation into the nation of massive amounts of workers and immigrants by capitalists seeking to sustain the national economy and keep it 'productive' in relation to other economies, such as China, with whom the British nation is made to compete. For British workers this means wages will be forced to be on a par with China, where the average wage for an industrial worker is twenty pounds a week, if the British economy is to compete in the Global Economy.

This is why a return to protectionist and semi-autarchic policies and a withdrawal from the Global Economy is the only way to prevent the destruction of the British working class who provide the labour for industries, the British middle class that run the industries and the British financial class that fund and create the national industries. Each faces total destruction as a result of global economics.

Stage IX (Eco Conflict):

Environmental destruction and its disruptive effects not only create internal and external conflicts but also protract and exacerbate ongoing internal disorders. Since conflict is a

'process' and not a one-time event, environmental issues can add a new dimension to enduring social, national or ethno-political disputes and newly created ethnic conflicts caused by mass immigration.

This is the final stage where the nation state is torn apart by internal conflict and the government has a choice: either impose a true 'Eco-Dictatorship' or accept the destruction of the civic order and the nation state's degeneration into a 'Balkans' type shambles of competing groups using terror as a bargaining tool for the allocation of ever diminishing resources.

Unless the Nationalist parties of Europe organise now to deal with this threat to our nations and environment we may witness the death of the West in our lifetime. This struggle against the plans of the European Union to allow in 'Eco-Refugees' must form part of a great 'Patriotic European Alliance' of all nationalist parties that represent the indigenous folk communities of Europe.


We must begin the struggle now and not wait for the nightmare to begin. This struggle is the primary battle of the 21st Century for the European peoples and one that we must not lose. From Ireland to Greece, from Iceland to Serbia, the European people must unite and resist these plans and fight to create a Fortress Europe that will ensure the survival of our Race, our Environment, our Rights and our Nations.

RESULTS: Economic decline in Britain



ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY: Home and Abroad

David Woolmer spent many years working in Arab and other Muslim countries and warns that the Christian Church in Britain does not even realise the threat posed to it by Islam



CRINGING LIBERAL: Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury

I am writing this as a new member of the party and an unashamed and committed Christian. My family came to England from France in 1132 so I used to say that I was very proud to be English. As a near 69-year-old I have seen so many of the things that made this country great fall by the wayside, weakened and even vilified by pathetic organisations such as Liberty, the Civil Rights movement, so-called "caring" politicians, and by the Muslim-biased Archbishop of Cant(erbury), Rowan Williams and his equally misguided Inter-Faith Relations Adviser Canon Michael Ipgrave. Also in on the act is the equally pathetic Community Faith Unit set up by our Government to smooth relations between the various faiths but which has particularly strong links with the Muslim Council!

Christianity was introduced into England by St. Augustine in 597 and remained our national religion until the end of the Second World War. Since then it has steadily been attacked and replaced by Islam!

I have had the great misfortune to have lived and worked in 10 Arab/Muslim countries. Even 15 years ago the situation for Christians and all other faiths who wished to practice their religion was fraught with danger. Nowadays the situation is far worse. In countries such as

Pakistan, Nigeria, Sudan, Indonesia, Iran and Egypt even indigenous Christians are - almost on a daily basis, beaten, tortured, killed, their womenfolk raped and their few churches shot at and burned. And yet, in this country we allow the likes of Bin Okri and Abu Hamsa, the appalling Dr Hook, to preach hatred and treason and then we allow a mosque a week to be built in this country. How often do we hear an apology from a Muslim cleric or from the Muslim Council of Britain for some of the acts committed by extreme fundamentalists?

I live in a pretty, mainly seventeenth century village which has one big drawback. Four miles away is Luton, recently voted the most unpleasant place to live in England. No prizes for guessing why!

MEDIEVAL, FEUDAL AND INTOLERANT

Despite the decency and sincerity of many of its followers, Islam is a medieval, feudal, repressive, chauvinistic and intolerant religion. It is the only faith which outlaws apostasy (changing from one religion to another). The punishment for any Muslim attempting to practice another faith is repudiation, banishment from his family and friends, physical punishment and often, death! Why we in the UK need to worry about the way Muslims treat Westerners and other faiths abroad is summed up by the words of many leading Muslim teachers including Abul A'la Mawdudi, one of the fathers of modern Islam, who stated: "The aim of Islam is to bring about a world revolution". Just as concerning were the recent words of the important Muslim teacher Dr Akbar Ahmed: "...although all Muslims are not terrorists all terrorists are Muslims". Remember, these are not the words of any right-wing fanatic!

I for one will strongly resist any attempt by Islam to weaken my faith in any way. I say that the protestors outside Belmarsh, many of whom I recognise as Abu Hamza supporters, are completely out of order. I will resist all/any attempts to delete words such as Christmas from our language or to make us take down crosses and crucifixes from cemeteries and crematoriums or, for that matter, any other signs of my faith which has been good enough for my family and for this nation for almost 1,400 years before Islam muscled in and attempted to foist itself and two million unwelcome guests on a once great country.

We cannot look for help from our Government, the Anglican Church or even our police force. I am more and more convinced that it is only the intervention of our Party that can prevent this once great country that we love being turned into a Muslim encave and an Islamic state. Then God help us as it would be like Hell on Earth!

The last stand of the Black Watch. Death in Iraq through Bush-Blair's folly.



The reward? This ancient Scottish regiment will soon be disbanded under New Labour's cuts.

Subscribe To Identity

The following rates are for 6 or 12 issues respectively (please tick box as applicable):

British Isles £15 ☐ £30 ☐

Overseas surface mail £16.50 ☐ £33 ☐

Unsealed air mail Europe £17.50 ☐ £35 ☐

Unsealed air mail Middle East, North and South America £24 ☐ £48 ☐

Unsealed air mail Australasia, Far East £25 ☐ £50 ☐

Please Note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If you are paying in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required with cheques and money orders and £2.50 with banknotes.

Name

Address

Postcode

Telephone

E-mail

All cheques etc should be made payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage' and sent to PO Box 907, Hull, HU6 9WY. You can subscribe online at www.bnp.org.uk. Photocopies can be used.

Identity Bulk Order Rates

5 - £9.25; 10 - £15; 15 - £20; 20 - £24.50; 25 - £29; 30 - £34; 40 - £43.50; 50 - £52.50; 60 - £62.50; 70 - £71.50;

80 - £81; 90 - £90.50; 100 - £100

Postage - £1.05 for 5; £1.94 for 10; £4.05 for 15 - 20; £4.34 for 25 - 30; £5.19 for 40 - 50